

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Final Office Action dated March 6, 2007 (the “Final Office Action.”)

Claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 16-19, 22, 26, 33, 34, and 38-44 are pending, with claim 44 withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 16-19, 22, 26, 33, 34, and 38-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,442,516 issued to Lee et al. (“Lee”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,425,123 issued to Rojas et al. (“Rojas”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,416,903 issued to Malcolm (“Malcolm”).

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are patentable and respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending rejections and objections in view of the remarks presented herein.

Constructive Election of Claims

Applicant acknowledges the requirement for restriction set forth in the Final Office Action, and the concomitant constructive election of claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 16-19, 22, 26, 33, 34, and 38-43 for prosecution on the merits. Claim 44, first presented in Applicant’s previous response dated October 25, 2006, now stands withdrawn.

Formal Matters

Applicant requests clarification of the terms “L10N” and “I18N” that are used at various points throughout the Final Office Action. The Final Office Action cites these terms as being

disclosed in the cited references. However, Applicant does not see these terms in the cited portions of the references.

Applicant believes that “L10N” may have been intended as a shorthand contraction of the term “localization.” Applicant believes that “I18N” may have been intended as a shorthand contraction of the term “internationalization.” Applicant respectfully requests a confirmation of this understanding. If these shorthand terms are used in the cited references, Applicant respectfully requests a citation to their usage for clarification of the record. Applicant respectfully requests clarification of these terms.

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 16-19, 22, 26, 33, 34, and 38-43 stand rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Rojas and further in view of Malcolm. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims include limitations that are not disclosed within the cited sections of the references. For example, independent claim 1 includes limitations of developing a base version of the application in a base language, and facilitating an internationalization of the base version of the application. The facilitating is performed “**concurrent with the developing of the base version of the application.**” At least this limitation of claim 1 is absent from the cited sections of the references.

With regard to this limitation, the Final Office Action cites the following portions of Lee.

P11 tool provides a method to perform concurrent national language translation builds. In the preferred embodiment, P11 tool is a build-tree merge tool which provides a method that **allows the development team to perform concurrent builds** on all the NLS build releases at any time during the development cycle. The invention also allows the development and build teams to discover NLS problems early in the product cycle.

(Lee at 3:56-63 (emphasis added).)

In the preferred embodiment, the tool is utilized by developers, build captains and PII coordinators. Developers utilize reports to debug translated build breaks and determine estimates of changed PII files. The tool also provides them the ability to build most current PII files.

(Lee at 4:58-64.)

The cited passages describe the use of a program integrated information (PII) tool to allow “concurrent builds” on all the natural language support (NLS) build releases at any time during a development cycle.

While the builds in Lee may be performed concurrently with each other, however, the cited passages do not include a teaching that a facilitating of an internationalization of a base version of an application is performed **concurrent with the developing of the base version of the application**. This limitation of claim 1 is therefore absent from the cited portions of Lee.

At least for this reason, claim 1 and all claims dependent therefrom are therefore allowable under § 103(a). At least for similar reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 18 and 34 and all claims dependent therefrom are also allowable under § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks set forth herein, the application and the claims therein are believed to be in condition for allowance without any further examination and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 512-439-5093.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia, 22313-1450, on May 7, 2007.

Cyrus Bharucha 2007 May 7
Attorney for Applicant Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,

Cyrus Bharucha

Cyrus F. Bharucha
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 42,324
Telephone: (512) 439-5097
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099